

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-4, 8-10, 12-18, 21, 23, and 24 are pending in this application. Claims 1-4 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. patent 5,805,118 to Mishra et al. (herein "Mishra") in view of U.S. patent 6,587,082 to Moore and U.S. patent 6,104,414 to Odryna et al. (herein "Odryna"). Claims 9, 18, 20, 21, 23, and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Mishra in view of Odryna. Claims 10 and 12-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Mishra.

Addressing first the rejection of claims 1-4 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Mishra in view of Moore and Odryna, and the rejection of claims 9, 18, 20, 21, 23, and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Mishra in view of Odryna, those rejections are traversed by the present response.

Initially, applicants note independent claim 1 is amended by the present response to clarify features recited therein. Specifically, independent claim 1 now recites:

wherein said transmission data includes data of a first data type for an entire screen and area updating data of a second data type different from the first data type for updating part of the entire screen ...

Independent claims 9, 18, 20, and 23 are similarly amended as in independent claim 1.

Such features are clearly supported by the original specification. For example in Figure 9 in the present specification as a non-limiting example, a data type 503 specifies whether a data type of a contents is raster data or solid data. Figure 10 shows a situation in which the data type is indicated as solid data and is directed to an entire screen. Figure 11 shows an example in which the data type is raster data directed to only the portions within the rectangles to be updated.

In the above-noted features the transmission data can take one of two different forms of either (1) a first data type for an entire screen (as a non-limiting example solid data) or (2)

a second data type different from the first data type for updating part of the entire screen (as a non-limiting example raster data).

Such features as clarified in the above-noted claims are believed to clearly distinguish over the applied art.

The basis for the outstanding rejection cites the teachings in Mishra at column 10, lines 43-65 and column 29, lines 1-25 and 36-45 to meet the limitations of the transmission-data generating unit that generates transmission data.¹ However, at those portions Mishra does not disclose or suggest generating any type of transmission data that includes the now clarified “data of a first data type for an entire screen and area updating data of a second data type different from the first data type for updating part of the entire screen”.

Moreover, no teachings in the further cited art to Moore or Odryna teach or suggest such features.

In such ways, applicants respectfully submit each of amended independent claims 1, 9, 18, 20, and 23, and the claims dependent therefrom, distinguish over the applied art.

Addressing now the rejection of claims 10 and 12-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Mishra, that rejection is also traversed by the present response.

Independent claim 10 positively recites that a “user interface displays icons indicating said image-display devices on said primary image-display device, and allocates the specific page to an icon to display the specific page on an image-display device corresponding to the icon”. Applicants respectfully submit such a feature clearly distinguishes over the teachings in Mishra.

With respect to the above-noted feature the outstanding rejection now appears to cite Mishra at column 29, lines 1-25. The outstanding rejection also specifically indicates Mishra

¹ Office Action of February 23, 2005, page 3, lines 3-8.

meets the claimed features as "Mishra teaches of user selectable miniature images that can be selected for full blown images viewing".²

Applicants respectfully submit that basis for the outstanding rejection is not properly considering each of the claim 10 features. Claim 10 recites that the user interface not only displays icons indicating the image-display device is on the primary image-display device, but also "allocates the specific page to an icon to display the specific page on an image-display device corresponding to the icon". Thus, the claims set forth controlling a correspondence between a page and the display device through manipulation of an icon. Mishra neither teaches nor suggests such features, and the outstanding rejection has not even addressed such features. The device of Mishra further does not teach any operation or benefit to assign a specific page to a selected image-display device through a manipulation of an icon.

In such ways, independent claim 10, and the claims dependent therefrom, are believed to clearly distinguish over Mishra.

As no other issues are pending in this application, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and it is hereby respectfully requested this case be passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Gregory J. Maier
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 25,599
Surinder Sachar
Registration No. 34,423

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

GJM:SNS\la

I:\ATTY\SNS\199813US-AM.DOC

² Office Action of February 25, 2005, pages 14-15, prenumbered paragraph 15.